Culture and Organization
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/gsco20

Becoming 'culturpreneur': How the 'neoliberal regime of truth' affects and redefines artistic subject positions

Bernadette Loacker [a]

[a] Department of Business Administration, Lund University, PO Box 7080, 220 07, Lund, Sweden

Version of record first published: 03 Apr 2012.

To cite this article: Bernadette Loacker (2013): Becoming 'culturpreneur': How the 'neoliberal regime of truth' affects and redefines artistic subject positions, Culture and Organization, 19:2, 124-145

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2011.644671

Culture and Organization, 2013
Vol. 19, No. 2, 124–145, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2011.644671

Becoming 'culturpreneur': How the 'neoliberal regime of truth' affects and redefines artistic subject positions

Bernadette Loacker*

Department of Business Administration, Lund University, PO Box 7080, 220 07 Lund, Sweden

(*Received 2 September 2010; final version received 13 May 2011*)

In relating to the politico-economic concept of 'creative industries', the paper explores in what way the art field and its actors are discursively repositioned within 'flexible cultural capitalism'. Through empirical material from the independent Austrian theatre scene, the paper, moreover, illustrates how the 'culturpreneurial' transformation of the field affects the specific artistic practices, forms of organizing and conduct. In this regard, it will be shown that the artists' modes of conduct are, at least to some extent, precarious: due to their ascetic and disciplined self-concept, artists seem to contribute, in parts, to their own marginalization as well as to the strengthening of certain 'neoliberal orders' and 'culturpreneurial subject ideals' of flexible capitalism – even though they are actually keen to resist current governmental technologies like the promotion of competition and market-determined assessment.

Keywords: artistic self-concepts; creative industries; governmentality; neoliberal subject ideals; precarization; theatre scene

Introduction

The art sector seems to have been re-evaluated in recent time, as within the 'knowledge society' (Castells 2001) creativity, flexibility and self-organization are discovered as 'critical factors for success' (Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009; Virno 2005). Referring to such changes, the paper at hand discusses why and how the art field and its actors are discursively redefined as 'creative industries' (CIs) or 'culturpreneurs' through 'neoliberal governmentality' (Böhm and Land 2009; Menger 2006). The paper, thereby, assumes that it is a central target of neoliberal governmentality to construct 'culturpreneurial' subject positions as generally desirable (Lazzarato 2007; Loacker 2010). However, building on case material from the field of independent theatre, in the empirical part of the paper it will be illustrated in what way artistic modes of conduct and the specific self-concepts of artists support such a target. The paper is structured as follows:

As the paper claims that neoliberal forms of power and government currently 'make up' artists as 'entrepreneurial creatives', the rationalities of the post-industrial 'regime of truth'[1] and its specific governmentality will be introduced in the first part of the paper. Based on a review of literature on European 'CIs' policy documents (e.g. London Department for CMS 2001), the paper subsequently analyses through which strategies the art field has been transformed into 'CIs' since the late 1990s and how this discursive re-definition is modulating, again, the socio-political positioning of

*Email: bernadette.loacker@fek.lu.se

artistic workers (Dalton 2001). In its empirical part, the paper then exemplarily demonstrates how the governmental definition of the art field as 'CIs' is perceived and judged by theatre makers and actors. In this regard, it will be shown that the effects of the 'CIs' power programme on the specific organizing and collaborating forms of artists are not very powerful. At the same time, it will be highlighted that the concrete artistic self-conception is, nonetheless, problematic; it partly strengthens the neoliberal subject ideal of the flexible and empowered individual (Lorey 2007) – even if the artists actually aim to reject current governmental strategies like the promotion of competition and marketization. However, as it is argued that current capitalism is capable to re-create critique according to its own interests (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005), the paper concludes with some short reflections on the definition of the art field and its actors as new role models of 'neoliberal governmentality'.

The power programme of 'neoliberal governmentality'

Following Foucault (2007, 2008), the concept of governmentality defines a complex of heterogeneous practices of power directed at the conduct of collective bodies and individuals, including their self-conduct. Government, thus, means the diversity of powers and authorities which regulate the subject's space of freedom (Barratt 2008). Analysts of governmentality are, now, 'concerned with the study of the language that authorities use in a practical sense to imagine and picture the objects and processes they aspire to govern' (Barratt 2008, 519–20). They are interested in the problematization of the rationality structures and norms of specific discourses, their related modes of government and their ways of acting on the productive subject (Foucault 1992, 14–16). In relation to neoliberal governmentality, this concern demands the analysis of current formations of power, modes of existence and subjectivity (Read 2009, 26).

First of all, neoliberal governmentality is a very heterogeneous and complex phenomenon. It does not represent a new paradigm of power and, thus, fully substitute previous forms of power like, e.g. 'disciplinary power' (Foucault 1994), which tended to dominate Western society in the first half of the twentieth century. Instead, neoliberalism, following the key idea of 'enterprise' (Barratt 2008, 520), seems to be composed of a variety of different forms and technologies of power and control (Foucault 2007, 107; Hamann 2009, 52; also Deleuze 1995). Since the early 1980s, neoliberal governmentality, however, has changed the relations of the realms of government and economy, the public and the private, the political and the personal (du Gay 1996; Rose and Miller 1992). Traditional distinctions between these realms or life aspects are blurred or reversed (Foucault 2008, 12–13). In the so-called 'control society'[2] boundaries between organizations, but also boundaries between nations and different fields of society, become, hence, increasingly dynamic and liquid (Bauman 2001; Castells 2001). Whereas the welfare state was structured through clear and stable boundaries as regards space and time, the post-industrial society is transformed into a network of transient, insecure and multiple associations. It is, thus, the idea of the 'network enterprise' that encroaches on the whole public space (Vandenberghe 2008, 881). Therefore, neoliberal governmentality implies a reduced role of the state in 'the economy and social relations, in favour of a new economy of social relations which emphasizes autonomy and individual responsibility at all the local levels' (Donzelot and Gordon 2008, 59) where they 'can be brought into interaction' (Donzelot and Gordon 2008, 59). In neoliberalism, the market becomes the main regulative principle of society; it defines the 'rules of the game' according to the particular economic order

of things (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005). The essential new role the state gains is to broadly 'install' market-based mechanisms for conditioning the conduct of individuals, the actions of institutions, social relations and the population as a whole (Hamann 2009, 41–2). Whereas classical liberalism focused on 'exchange' as the general matrix of social orders, neoliberalism focuses on competition (Read 2009, 27). This implies that all spheres of cultural, social and human existence can become potential fields of labour and production (Virno 2005). This tendency, again, seems to be characteristic for a society that is dominated by a logic of rivalry and investment. However, 'governance without government' (Rose and Miller 1992) has various consequences: they range from governmental policy-making according to the private corporate and industry interests, to the privatization of goods and public institutions (like, e.g. hospitals, prisons, universities, theatres, museums), to the self-responsibilization of individuals for their employment, welfare, health, etc. (Foucault 2008; Thanem 2009). Put differently, many areas and aspects that were once understood as social and political are, within the neoliberal 'regime of truth', repositioned within the domain of self-management (Hamann 2009, 40).

Neoliberalism seen as a political project can be characterized through a 'government of individualization' (Foucault 1982, 211) that isolates and 'separates the individual, breaks his links with others (and) splits up community life' (Foucault 1982, 211–2). So neoliberalism is not just a manner of governing populations, 'states or economies, but is intimately tied to the government of the individual, to a particular manner of living' (Read 2009, 27). Contemporary governmental strategies, thereby, seek to mobilize rather than constrain the subject. They include both subtle government from 'outside' (e.g. through making desirable conduct and activities 'inexpensive') and 'self-government' (Read 2009, 28). Neoliberal governmentality mainly functions through the imposing of indirect forms of power and control – like the production of uncertainty, competition and continuous evaluation – that structure and shape field of actions and autonomies of individuals (Vandenberghe 2008, 887). It, thus, operates through the interests, desires and aspirations of individuals, not or hardly through direct obligations, commands and restrictive rules (Read 2009, 29).

In order for the – dynamic and non-territorialized – market to unfold its regulative forces and reproduce itself, it demands flexible subjects that are (more or less) 'free', subjects that can be made the object of competitive and rivalling strategies (Weiskopf and Loacker 2006). Against this background, providing a certain 'personal autonomy is not the antithesis of political power, but a key term in its exercise' (Rose and Miller 1992, 174). So neoliberal governmentality can also be viewed as a particular production of subjectivity: its central target seems to be the 'creation of social conditions that encourage and necessitate the production of homo economicus, a historically specific form of subjectivity constituted as a free and autonomous 'atom' of self-interest' (Hamann 2009, 37). Whereas the classical liberal 'version' of homo economicus was constituted as a 'man of exchange', the neoliberal homo economicus is fashioned rather as an 'empowered' and hyper-productive 'entrepreneur of the self' (du Gay 1996). As such he is his own potential, his own capital, his own producer, the source of his own earnings, success and satisfaction (Foucault 2008, 226; Thanem 2009). First of all, though, he is obliged to his, variable, 'human capital', indicating the dissolving between labour and capital (Read 2009, 28). As the 'human capital' defines the individual market value and position, the entrepreneur is, however, keen to continuously invest in it – in a strategic and self-responsible manner (Hamann 2009, 43–4).

To recapitulate: In discursively defining individuals as subjects of 'human capital' and, thus, as active and central part of the market, neoliberal governmentality intends to aspire individuals to govern – and discipline – themselves (Vandenberghe 2008, 885). In this vein, it appears as the management of individual and collective freedom (Foucault 2008, 29), where 'freedom' also operates as a precarious form of subjection (Read 2009, 25). As already hinted at, control societies are primarily characterized through the governmental strategy of 'mobilization' and 'enterprising up' (Deleuze 1995, 254–6; Weiskopf and Loacker 2006). Hence, neoliberal or post-disciplinary forms of power tend to become decentralized, free-floating and often immaterial – like the contents that are the object of control (Lazzarato 1998, 45). As 'permanent economic tribunal' (Foucault 2008, 340) of the neoliberal 'regime of truth', the market continuously monitors and evaluates individuals, their performances and activities. It is, now, exactly the market's tendency of dis-limitation, and the mutability of its 'demands' and assessment criteria, that makes it a very effective instance of power – deregulation is not the absence of government; it is, instead, a powerful technology of governing within neoliberalism (Read 2009, 34). To escape the order of current market-driven capitalism seems to be impossible (Vandenberghe 2008, 878–81). Due to its dynamic self-regenerating and -transforming forces, the 'new spirit of capitalism' (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005) is also often termed 'inventive and creative' (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005; Donzelot and Gordon 2008).[3] This was, again, already noted by Deleuze and Guattari (1980, 580) who emphasized that 'capitalism is of the viral type' (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 580) because it seems to be qualified to renew and redirect itself towards its own ends, like a parasite. However, in the following section it will be shown how this 'viral type', and, thus, neoliberal rationalities and 'entrepreneurial' orders – expressed and promoted through the 'CIs' policy – have infused the art field since the 1990s and, in doing so, have deeply transformed the discursive social positioning of artists.

The governmental transformation of the art field into 'CIs'

At first, it should be mentioned that the current marketization of the art field does not fit into the European cultural tradition, particularly not in the tradition of German-speaking nations (e.g. EKKD/Enquete-Kommission Kultur in Deutschland 2007, 333; KMW/Kulturdokumentation, Mediacult, Wifo zu Wiener CI 2004, 11). Even in the second half of the twentieth century, the Central European cultural policy still followed the ideal of 'art for art's sake' to a large extent – precisely because large autonomies and independencies of artists were considered as preconditions for the unfolding of artistic practice (Adorno and Horkheimer 1977; Mayerhofer and Mokre 2007, 299). This understanding implies, among other things, that the state declared itself responsible for the support and funding of the art field, its institutions and actors. The cultural policy was, furthermore, characterized through a strong social democratic and participative orientation as cultural diversity and plurality were intended and encouraged. The various aesthetic and empancipatory potentials of the 'art worlds' seemed, thus, to be appreciated by the majority of the politicians and the public (Zembylas and Mokre 2003).

However, since the 1990s the 'entrepreneurial' transformation of the arts has become noticeable (Menger 2006, 14). The development that the economic significance of 'art and creativity' is positioned in the middle of the international art and cultural policy debates seems to have had its origin in Great Britain (Mayerhofer and Mokre

2007, 293; O'Connor 2000). In the meantime it is also apparent in the Western and Central Europe policies that culture, art and its diverse functions are no longer understood as being contradictory to commercial imperatives and market logics (Dalton 2001; KMU/KMU Forschung Austria 2003, 6). This governmental transformation of the art field was, now, first expressed through the concept of the 'cultural industries', introduced by the Greater London Council in 1992.[4] However, after the boom of the new media in the late 1990s, the 'cultural industries' policy was substituted for the one of 'CIs': the London 'Department for Culture, Media and Sport' labelled the CI-field as the new white hope of socio-political, cultural and economic progress (Alanen 2007).

The concept of CI was also an essential part of the 'creative economy policy' that Tony Blair presented in 1997. Blair intended to involve the art and artistic strategies in all areas of economy and welfare (Mörsch 2003, 62). Social inclusion, regeneration, access and diversity were defined as the most important aims of his 'creative Britain' campaign (London Department for CMS 1998). Hence, the interest 'to make the arts and culture part of our "core script"' relates to Blair's assumption that 'a nation that cares about art will not just be a better nation. In the early 21st century it will be a more successful one'.[5] This statement clearly indicates that the art sector is being re-evaluated as a domain that contributes to the mobilization of the general growth of western nations (KMU Forschung Austria 2003, 3). The most well-known CI definition seems to make the argument clearer: the 'creative industries include all branches and activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property' (London Department for CMS 1998, 3). This CI definition shows that not just any form of creativity is required, but a form of (individual) creativity that can be transformed into 'valuable' economic, social, human and cultural 'capital' (Townley, Beech, and McKinlay 2009). It makes evident that art and culture have become colonized and integrated into the market's system (EKKD 2007, 333). Besides, the definition points out that under the CI-government label a variety of heterogeneous fields of 'creative', cultural and artistic work – fields with very different structures, resources, orientations, activities, moral codes and aesthetic ideals – are subsumed (Eichmann, Flecker, and Reidl 2007).

However, that the economy nowadays increasingly interpenetrates culture and transforms it into a commodity (Vandenberghe 2008, 892), becomes clearly evident if one looks at the different Central European country-specific cultural policy reports. They are all primarily interested in the economic potentials of artistic professions and activities (KMW 2004, 21). In the following, some of the governmental strategies which are promoted through the current CI policy and which increasingly structure and govern the artists' fields of action will be mentioned.[6]

(1) The promotion of autonomy, self-responsibility and self-government: The CI concept constructs cultural organizations and artists as autonomous 'enterprises'. The increasing demand for self-management is thereby presented as a liberation from traditional constraints (Ministerium für Wirtschaft und Mittelstand, Technologie und Verkehr des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen 2001, 9–11). So the unconditional support of the artistic field is no longer part of the political script (Lange et al. 2009, 328–31). By contrast, the CI policy declares artists and artistic organizations as self-responsible for their existence (Blair 2007).

(2) The promotion of artistic commercialization, self-marketing and service-orientation: In a liberalized art field, art markets are transformed into 'reputation markets' (Menger 2006, 31). These days, art institutions are asked to look after their 'corporate identity' (Florida 2002) as they have to be 'attractive' in order to justify any further support from the state or other promoters (Caves 2000; Leadbeater 2007). For the singular artists, 'investments' in one's specific 'self-presentation' – and thus 'brand' – are, by trend, unavoidable, too (Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009, 366).
(3) The promotion of competition and of techniques of competitive scoring: The CI concept stimulates rivalry and competition for subsidies and sponsors among cultural organizations and workers (KMW 2004, 11). Rivalry is, e.g. produced through contracts that are based around 'talent competitions'. In these – often public – competitions, 'artists' and their talents, competencies and project ideas are all compared, evaluated and ranked. 'Appropriate' actors that seem to be 'good-players' are selected (Kunze 2007, 233; Menger 2006, 25–6).
(4) The promotion of market orientation and permanent assessment: These days, the cultural field is transformed into a 'marketplace of ideas' which re-defines 'creativity' as an economic resource that the market simultaneously mobilizes, wastes and controls (EKKD 2007, 333). The subsidization of art organizations and projects is increasingly understood as an 'investment' (Gray 2002) that must pay off (Böhm and Land 2009, 79). The arts and artists have, thus, to continuously prove their (public) 'value' and 'usefulness' (Kunze 2007, 233).
(5) The promotion of uncertainties, flexibility and activity: The art field is a so-called 'winner-take-it-all-market': income and reputation are very unequally distributed (Abbing 2002, 280; KMW 2004, 19). The CI policy can, in this regard, be seen as a series of governmental strategies for the mobilization of 'human capital' (also Böhm and Land 2009). The high dynamics and deregulation of the field, thus, imply an increased relevance of 'self-entrepreneurialism' and demand to orientate on one's own employability and market position (Mörsch 2003, 63).
(6) The promotion of individualization: There are currently very strong political forces to promote individualization and separation within the art field (Haunschild 2003). Institutionalized structures for coordinating interests hardly exist; dependencies on network contacts are in return high (Haak 2008; KMW 2004, 11–13). As responsibilities, risks and uncertainties of artistic work have recently been individualized, 'risk management' becomes an important competence of artists and artistic organizations (Europäische Kommission 1998, 19–22).
(7) The promotion of immaterial values and 'freedom': The CI rhetoric and policy finally attribute a high amount of passion and selflessness to artists that must follow their calling, paid or voluntary (Eichmann, Flecker, and Reidl 2007, 11–13; KMW 2004, 12–13). The political CI-reform argument seems to be that economic certainty, stability and wealth do not fit into the artistic self-understanding and 'life style', but 'disturb' and constrain artistic work and organizing practices (Lotter 2007).

Summing up, one can argue that through the CI policy art becomes functionalized and instrumentalized by market-driven logics (Virno 2005). Though it should be noted

that the current CI policy does not only refer to the 'economization of culture' but also to the 'culturalization of economy' (Goehler 2006; Virno 2005). Against this background, it has to be emphasized that it is part of the discourse of CI[7] not to focus just on the direct economic contributions but also on the indirect economic benefits – like innovation, education, employability and engagement – that the art field and the activities of its actors provide (Blair 2007; KMU Forschung Austria 2003). This means that the CI discourse defines the art sector as responsible for strengthening both economic growth and social reproduction (Böhm and Land 2009, 94). However, through the governmental strategies described, not just the alignment and function of artistic practice are prescribed but also the conduct of the actors of the art field is currently tried to be determined in a very specific way. So what does the profile of the artist that is inherent in or rather produced through the CI programme, look like?

The illustrated governmental programme makes evident that the artist is no longer made up as an 'outsider, nonconformist, romanticist and rebel' as it was the case in the nineteenth century (Mayerhofer and Mokre 2007, 299). Whereas in the spirit of modernity, it was part of the idea of man to see the artist as an autonomous genius, being in strict opposition to the rational 'homo oeconomicus' of the civil society (Kunze 2007, 231–2), in the twenty-first century the artist, discursively constructed as 'culturpreneur' (Davies and Ford 1998), is positioned in the 'centre' of society (Menger 2006, 10–14). The 'model of the culturpreneur' indicates the alignment of market-determined, entrepreneurial, creative and aesthetic demands or, in other words, the alignment of generous idealism and calculating materialism (Koppetsch 2006, 198). The hybrid character of the 'culturpreneur' is subsequently expected to balance creativity, spontaneity and authenticity, on the one hand, with market 'needs', economic demands and uncertainties, on the other hand (Lange 2007, 21). The 'culturpreneur' provides large cultural capabilities, contributes to economic development and simultaneously facilitates the increase in social cohesion (Hesmondhalgh 2007, 12). This way, he is his own 'human capital' not just for himself (Foucault 2008, 226); rather he shares his cultural, social and symbolic 'capital' with others.

Altogether, the CI concept and policy indicate the integration of the arts into the 'flexible capitalism' and its rationalities. Related governmental strategies seem to present a challenge to established power structures of the artistic field and confront its actors with new normative expectations. In the next section, it will be exemplarily illustrated how these are experienced and judged by artists engaged in the field of independent theatre. Besides, it will be asked to what extent new modes of regulating the arts transform individual and collective realities, self-concepts and modes of conduct within a specific field of practice.

Empirical insights from the independent Austrian theatre scene

The empirical material presented in the following section wants to contribute to 'exemplary knowing' (Kannonier-Finster and Ziegler 1998). It stems from a large ethnographic case study (Lüders 2003, 389–95) that was conducted at a non-institutionalized, professional theatre in Innsbruck/Austria between March 2007 and April 2008.[8] Part of the study was the shadowing of a particular theatre production process and the conduct of 15 open, semi-structured interviews with theatre as well as ensemble members (also Loacker 2010).

However, as the research process was guided by an 'explorative approach' (Czarniawska 1998), a flexible, context-related and methodically plural research strategy was followed (Kannonier-Finster and Ziegler 1998). The open process-orientation of the ethnography allowed focussing upon the specific practices (of organizing); this made, again, evident, how heterogeneous demands were handled, and, thus, how the 'rules of the game' were enacted and re-created within applying them. The following questions were the focal point of the research process: How does the 'entrepreneurial shift' of the cultural field transform modes of organizing (work relations)? How do the artists perceive the 're-evaluation' of the cultural field? How do they relate the image of the 'culturpreneur' and its ideals to themselves and their artistic self-understanding? How do the actors of this field deal with ambivalences between political, economic and professional demands? How do they individually and collectively resist, transgress or subscribe to the expectations that the 'culturpreneurial discourse' constitutes?

The empirical material offered below mainly derives from the interviews that were conducted within the course of the ethnographic study. The interview sample consists, more precisely, of the theatre's artistic and commercial managers, the ensemble's director and assistant director, of three actors and two actresses, one costume director, one stage designer, two stage managers and two technicians. On average the interviews lasted 3 h; they were all fully transcribed and coded (with NVivo). In the analysis of the empirical material, it was tried to follow a 'reflexive methodology' (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000). Besides, the empirical insights of the study were communicatively and argumentatively validated (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000, 255; Lamnek 1995, 157).

Now, first of all it will be shown how the theatre makers and actors of the ensemble experience and react to the current cultural policy in their daily practices. Subsequently, the self-understanding the particular artists follow will be illustrated. To what extent this understanding is affected by the image of the 'culturpreneur' will be part of the related discussion.

Experience of the new 'culturpreneurial governmental programme'

Even if most of the theatre makers shadowed, mention, that they feel not able to systematically judge current modifications of the art field, they all agree that the field and its policy are changing. From their perspective, the recent economization of the arts is mainly a result of present cultural policy strategies. The director interviewed, e.g. speaks about 'far-reaching transformations' that the theatre scene has been undergoing for two decades:

> In the early eighties the policy and the media were at pains to support diverse artistic projects. Their aim was to maintain the plurality of the field. Such a supportive practice is no longer imaginable today. Nowadays not only the policy but also the media calculate as hard as bone if it is profitable to support a project. (…) As a consequence the multiplicity diminishes. But probably it still exists, but you don't see it. Today theatres are closed down.

Following the artists' perception, the logic of the market becomes increasingly dominant within the field of theatre. This tendency is, again, not least attended by a redefinition of the functions of the arts and artists, as an actor explains:

> The state increasingly hands over responsibility. For the policy makers the most important criteria are efficiency and quota – numbers are easy to count. And it is bizarre how cultural organizations, like museums, for example, adopt this logic. You just have to focus on their rhetoric. By contrast, only a few people still talk about the educational function of art.

The theatre makers do not want to understand why art is, these days, just seen as valuable when it is exploitable and able to clearly indicate its 'exchange value'. They neglect, to a large extent, the demand to orientate their artistic practice on the 'market'. Besides, they massively problematize the political distribution of the cultural budget. It is either established art institutions (like the Vienna State Opera House) that are supported or those cultural offers that promise a high 'return on investment', so the actors' experience:

> The economy has different mechanisms and logics, I know; what is efficient and sold that is seen as important. And if these mechanisms are integrated into the arts, then it happens that musicals are valued highly as this brings money; this is the creative economy. I have the feeling that today anything that doesn't deliver big numbers isn't counted, has no value and is, thus, not supported. And this development is very dangerous in my opinion. (actress)

In this regard, the theatre makers also emphasize that today every singular artistic activity is assessed – 'on a very obscure market' (director). Apart from the fact that they are convinced that art can never be appropriately appraised, they criticize that the audit systems used are very seldom orientated towards the contents of the projects that are to be evaluated:

> The approvals are actually a lottery. (…) Most of the time these projects win which reach consensus, projects where nobody is enthusiastic but where everybody says, 'well, why not? – doesn't hurt'. Well, if you know the internal mechanisms, then you can try to use tactics, but in the end it is still open how the play runs. And besides, I have my images and ideas as artist, and I can't really say what the subsidies board wants to hear. (director)

However, the theatre makers seem to be aware that changes in the cultural landscape have resulted in modulated political and economic demands. Referring to the increased local cultural offer, one of the technicians interviewed argues in this context:

> Today it is necessary to connect with other groups and organizations, to build alliances within the scene. (…) New groups which aren't yet established must practice this network thought even more. They are really dependent on this amicable networking. They couldn't survive without that. Furthermore, the aspect of self-marketing is of increasing relevance and can no longer be completely ignored. But one has to be careful with this issue.

Yet even though the theatre makers obviously know that strategic practices like caring for contacts or investing in the organization's 'corporate image' would be positively valued on the independent art market and, thus, support promotion, they do not necessarily behave according to the requests mentioned:

> Our theatre could gain much more attention and people if we invested a bit more in entrepreneurial activities. But in our theatre the dominant philosophy is, 'we have other things to do than to care about our image'. And then there is this attitude, 'we do what we think we should do, no matter what the others think of us. And we can even survive without any support. (technician)

The 'marketization' and 'liberalization' of the art field constitute, however, a variety of 'challenges' for the theatre makers. The financial restrictions and, thus, (politico)economic dependencies are large, they likewise admit:

> You must be able to afford to work in the theatre or to sustain such an organization. If you are engaged in this scene, you must not have any material requirements and you are dependent on others. Either you have people around you who support your theatre due to idealistic reasons or you are asked to curry favour with politicians or corresponding responsible persons. That is fatal. (assistant director)

Simultaneously, the theatre makers seem to have been used to acting in-between artistic and economic demands for a long time, and so they explain that theatre is always on the 'edge of extinction'. Hence, all the artists reject to adapt to the logic of 'enterprise', as, e.g. the following statement of the theatre's assistant director clearly expresses:

> The problem is, nowadays you have to be a politician and an entrepreneur to manage a theatre successfully. You should go after inside relationships and contacts and then you should maintain these. You should curry favour, make a fool of yourself, in all directions; then you can find the related promoters. But we don't act that way. No.

However, in the context at hand, it seems that the new power programme, including increased risk and competition promotion as well as insecure and varying subsidies, does not deeply affect the specific theatre's *artistic* performance. Still, in parts, it seems to influence the more general theatre's practices of acting; insofar as its managers show a more cautious and conservative behaviour towards funding institutions. Such a conduct is, maybe needless to say, criticized by several actors:

> Currently I see a movement towards a restoration and 'conservation' of theatre, it is like a political museums order. (. . .) Today one expresses oneself in the subjunctive. So we have subjunctive-theatre at the moment. (actor)

Even if the actors in the concrete field of practice do, by no means, simply subject to the logics and orders invented through the CI policy, the quote points out that new modes of regulating and organizing the art field produce a variety of tensions. Nonetheless, the theatre makers and actors still define the attempt to 'be as autonomous as possible' and 'to remain true to one's beliefs' as a central task of *theatre*:

> Theatre must always follow the attempt to make good work. It is not allowed to be satisfied with easy solutions and it must not subject to expectations and trends it cannot support; it must fight despite all difficulties, insecurities, pressures and inequalities that characterize the field today. (actor)

So although the artists engaged in the independent theatre scene do not feel that their practice is held in high esteem by the current policy makers – they argue their work is generally seen as an 'amusing hobby' that can be practiced for free – they do not want to give up the hope for a new cultural policy:

> I would wish that a policy emerges that has another strategy than the production of competition. I would wish that artistic projects must not trump other initiatives to be seen as valuable. I would wish that one orientates again more on the contents and the quality than on formalities and political or economic interests. And I would wish that the politicians but also the society develop again more courage to support artistic productions that are less mass-orientated and that have less superficial show character. (actor)

Despite the increasing (mass) market-orientation, commercialization, and, thus, by trend, homogenization of the art field and its 'offers', the artists interviewed all show

themselves convinced that the economy can never suppress what the arts constitute and practice; they follow the belief that the human being and society will always look for events, idea(l)s and relations that are not dominated by economic orders and logics of calculating exchange.

However, in the following section the normative expectations with which the *singular artists* are nowadays confronted are more explicitly illustrated. It will, thus, be discussed which modes of conduct are currently requested from artists or promoted through the particular governmentality of the art field. Besides, it will be shown which specific self-understanding the actors themselves follow – and to what extent this understanding can, again, strengthen or weaken discursively produced subject positions and neoliberal rationalities more generally.

Experience of new 'culturpreneurial subject ideals'

As already hinted at in the previous section, the art field is characterized through 'spectacular inequalities' (Abbing 2002; Menger 2006). The consequences include artists holding multiple jobs on a contractual basis, chronic un(der)employment, very low and shifting income structures and, thus, incalculable biographies. As a trend, precarious working and living conditions are today the norm within the field (McRobbie 2009). In this regard a theatre maker, active in the scene for 30 years, comments:

> The current conditions are much more difficult, much more insecure and risky than in former times. The demands are extremely high, you must be very efficient, you must function, you can't afford any mistakes ... yes, the 'lightness' doesn't exist anymore. (director)

Within the last decade competition and, thus, social and economic insecurity have increased noticeably in the theatre field. According to the experience of the well-versed theatre makers, 15 years ago it was still possible to plan your path as an artist; by contrast, nowadays one can no longer speak of a 'career', as the theatre's artistic manager explains:

> Formerly you could continuously work your way up. Such careers no longer exist. (...) The competition is so intensive; the selection procedures are very hard and incalculable. There are so many unemployed actors that are very good and qualified. Everybody fights to get an engagement. From the manager's point of view you could say, that's fine, you can choose from a large pot. For the artists the situation is very hard. They are asked to be permanently flexible, show initiative and be self-organized, and with the money you get you actually cannot survive.

First of all, the culturpreneurial transformation of the field seems, thus, to pose a variety of challenges for the single artist. How the normative expectations and, so, the specific artistic profile are currently changing becomes also evident through the following statement from the director interviewed:

> Today it is necessary to be communicative and open, to be present, to market yourself. This requires some sort of abandon. And you must care for your reputation; if you want to be re-engaged; you should show loyal conduct within production processes. (...) Then you must be able to cope with these extremely changeable conditions; you must take self-responsibility, you must be able to self-manage your life under these discontinuous circumstances. This is a very provoking task.

Financial constraints and uncertainties are the artists' largest problem. Still, many artists are willing to accept very low pay; not least because they make an 'investment' in their 'vita' with every single project in which they participate. In this regard, the artistic manager argues:

> My impression is that in our theatre the artists come because they feel good and like to be here – and because we offer very good, interesting and beautiful roles. (. . .) But primarily, they must take the offers because they have to invest in their vita, this becomes more and more important – what else do they have to show?

To be able to make such 'investments', artists are, again, dependent on network contacts. The request to become involved in 'networks' and, thus, to cultivate contacts with high market reputation is also recognized by the self-employed actors; so they are aware that the strategic management of one's artistic contacts is of high relevance these days. Nevertheless, they evade calculating network activities as far as possible. The demand for competing on engagements, etc. is likewise massively rejected by the actors in this specific context. The same holds true for the demand to work on and invest in one's artistic 'brand' and the demand to 'capitalize' on individual 'creative capabilities'. This attitude is, e.g. expressed in the following statement of an actor:

> Even if you can no longer survive without self-marketing, it is so hard for me to present and sell myself. I won't occupy myself with such activities. I want to block this demand out. (. . .) But this relates to an ambivalence of our work. We have to move between our own ideas and wishes and the demands of others. The question of adoption is a very difficult one.

That the current promotion of uncertainty, self-responsibility, rivalry and continuous market assessment within the art field constitutes heterogeneous dependencies for the artists, the examples mentioned seem to make evident. However, the artists shadowed try to avoid 'entrepreneurial activities' to the greatest possible extent – as such thinking and acting would not 'correspond to their "character":

> For sure it would help if you would have some sort of, let's say, 'strategic calculus' and entrepreneurial skills. But I don't have them; I am not interested in such things; that's awful to me. (. . .) Well, what I think I have is will power, discipline, courage and confidence. And this is probably quite important because . . . as actor you must go through tough times, again and again. (actor)

In naming self-discipline and asceticism as well as passion, courage, transgression and idealism as central elements of their artistic ethos, the actors are, however, keen to distinguish their selves and (self)practices from the notion of 'enterprise' and the related moral codes.

Now, the specific *artistic self-conception and understanding* the actors follow becomes even more evident when shedding light on the governmental strategy of *individualization*, enforced through the current cultural policy. First of all, there is no institutionalized representation of interests in the independent art scene. The actors do not complain about this circumstance since they do not expect somebody else to take responsibility for them:

> It would be nice if somebody would advocate or lobby for us and our working conditions. Yes, that would be really nice if somebody would relieve us of this responsibility (*laughing*). But what could one actually do and who could do that? I don't know. (actress)

Besides, many actors refuse public representation of interest since they fear that it would lead to more regulation of their profession and interference in artistic activities:

> I don't know what such initiatives should be good for?! If actors are in a labour union, what then happens is that the rehearsal is interrupted during me saying 'to be, or . . .' – just because it is two o'clock, and the rule is at two o'clock a break must be made. This is crazy. The profession of actors cannot be pressed into strict timetables, mealtimes or be ordered through certainty and things like that. The actor must say, 'to be, or not to be – that is the question', when it has to be. (. . .) The artist must not have security. He must fail, for the art. (actor)

So some of the actors follow a very critical and 'archaic' self-image. They, moreover, attribute to the 'standard artist' a 'difficult and narcissistic' character. In this regard, one actor problematizes that most artists do not have adequate self-discipline and will:

> If the actor is on stage and he doesn't get enough money to survive, then he shall become a carpenter. It is his responsibility. You are only an artist if somebody pays you. (. . .) I don't like actors that are financed by the state, like magistrates. They can hang around and do not have to care. I don't like this attitude; I wouldn't support that. (. . .) If you have the certainty you start to become lethargic. The artistic profession is different than others. I think artists are outsiders of society. They should be in misery, they must have the passion and confidence that they must do what they do; otherwise one is not a good actor.

Such (self)images of the artist explain, at least to some extent, why there are also hardly self-initiated networks that could enable the formation of a 'common voice' of the self-employed artists in the independent theatre scene. There are individual amicable connections and cooperations as regards contents; but there are actually no intentions to thematize the, generally problematic, work and life situation of artists and/or the actual strategies of the cultural policy in public. In this regard one of the actresses declares:

> I am not sure which effects such movements could have because you can always bring up the argument that nobody has to become an artist and that everybody knows in what he gets involved. One can always say, 'you don't have to complain, you knew what the chances were'.

Rather than 'complaining', the actors emphasize it was their 'own conscious decision' to become an artist. Simultaneously, most of them explain that they 'have no alternative' for themselves as the artistic practice would be their 'calling'. Certain statements, furthermore, strengthen the idea that the intensive competition and the precarious work situations of artists are or can be used as very effective strategies that promote individualization among artists – while they decrease the risk of resistance:

> The problem in our field is that the pay is extremely low but there are so many unemployed artists so that there are always some who are willing to work for this money. This makes it, for example, difficult to use tactics in contract negotiations . . .. even if it is said, 'don't sell yourself below value'. This is a bit of a paradox. (actress)

The uncertain and discontinuous artistic working conditions are, as shown, scarcely reviewed by the artists. In a sense it seems to be part of their self-understanding to live within precarious conditions. Statements like 'artists should not live in the lap of

luxury' refer to such an image. Additionally, the view exists that artists have other missions and duties than to feel ashamed about their selves and modes of existence. Moreover, a common understanding prevails regarding the fact that very low salaries and the status of permanent insecurity are the price they pay for their individual 'autonomy' and the chance of 'thinking, acting and being different(ly)'. Thus, the study at hand shows that as long as the artists perceive chances of autonomy, participation, joy and self-determination within their direct work environment, they agree to the 'dark sides' of their work. It was, indeed, tried to point out that the power structures, currently regulating the art field, strongly limit individual 'freedoms' which are principally inherent in the artistic profession.

However, there seems to exist a certain mythological connection between creativity and poverty that is, again, supported by the 'culturpreneurial' governmental programme. This connection follows the assumption that artistic biographies and employment forms have to be fragile and fragmented so that creativity can unfold. As the explanations have shown, the actors do not 'just' accept individualized 'creative impoverishment' (McRobbie 2009), some of them even explain that misery is 'necessary' for the art and its practice and demanded by the 'real artist'. Now, principally one can record that the very high extent of self-discipline, commitment and engagement that the artists demand from themselves constitutes a tendency of self-exploitation. Though, the attempt to be governed or exploited 'by others' or demands 'from the outside' is massively criticized. Against the background of the partly precarious artistic self-conceptualization shown, it may, certainly, appear as paradox that the actors mention *self-governance* as a central aim of their artistic practice and, more generally, of their conduct of life. The fact that they train their mind and body daily is, for instance, to enable them to increasingly concentrate on their own values, ethics and beliefs. Even if the artists claim to be aware that their 'independence' will always be limited in a certain way, the attempt not to be determined by external prescriptions and 'standards' is, still, one of their prime ideals (also Foucault 1992, 12). This implies, among others, that the artists do not want to approve those 'rules of the game' they actually reject. In other words, the artists refuse to subject to, discursively constituted, moral codes and norms that are *not comprehensive and reasonable* for them, as the following quote finally highlights:

> I am very critical towards external codes which want to define what is good and right. (. . .) And I am not willing to accept all the rules of the current economy; I think one must not. (. . .) The significant question is what is or should be your own ethics. This is the essential point – to what extent do you adapt to others and external demands, and when is it necessary to start to fight and say: 'sorry, that's no longer me. That's no longer a path I can support. (costume designer)

Hence, one can argue that critically reflecting upon normative invocations serves as a vital element of artistic *practice,* insofar as the artists try to resist the attempt to exert influence and control on their artistic *work* and ideals. The actors are, thus, generally not willing to subscribe to the moral codes of the 'CIs' programme; more precisely, to the normative demand to compare, commercialize, capitalize and compete (on) their 'creativity' (also Townley, Beech, and McKinlay 2009).

Now, the empirical study at hand shows that the specific artistic self-concept is rather hybrid and that the artistic self-identities are characterized through several contradictions. The ambiguous self-concepts of the artists are, e.g. expressed through the

following attitudes: individualization, that is in high gear within the theatre scene, is accepted, whereas individualized competition is disclaimed; social and economic uncertainties are, at least partly, problematized; stabilities and predictabilities are simultaneously rejected; and most basically, the artists follow the aim of self-determination and self-governance; large inequalities and exploitation tendencies that structure their field of activity are still accepted.

Nonetheless, one can, at the same time, assume that the self-image of the artists is mainly inspired and governed by their immaterial, ethical-aesthetic ideals and beliefs. The artistic ('professional') discourse, and the specific organizational contexts in which they are embedded and active, build the dominant frame for the formation of their self-identity (Loacker 2010). In contrast, the subject ideal of the strategic 'culturpreneur', invented through the CI discourse, possesses no 'attractiveness' for the actors. At first sight, the normalizing effects of the current 'culturpreneurial shift' on the artistic subjectivity and the concrete practices of organizing (relations) seem, thus, not to be very powerful – most of the artists even do not know the 'label' and policy of CI. However, if one focuses on singular CI governmental strategies, it becomes visible that the artistic workers subscribe to some of them – in particular, the promotion of self-responsibilization, individualization and self-control, whereas they clearly resist others, like, e.g. the promotion of market-orientation, competition and strategic networking. In principle, it seems that the artists try to resist those CI discourse-specific prescriptions and codes that, in their view, attack and threaten their artistic ideals and, thus, their selves. On the contrary, if the codes and norms are perceived as being in line with their self-image, they are accepted. Interestingly in this regard, the 'practice of critique' is seen as an essential function of theatre; so the artists interviewed within this study explain that it is a very significant mission of the arts to problematize established 'regimes of truth' and 'what has been taken for granted up to now' (also Foucault 1992). This intent does, however, not apply in relation to their own individual working and living conditions. It is not part of the artistic self-image and ethos to be 'allowed' to moan about one's situation; it is, instead, some sort of taboo. The central concern of the actors is to practise and *care for the art* – and not for one's own (economic) situation.

Summing up at this point, the present empirical investigation exemplarily demonstrates that the governmental transformations of the art field provide several ambivalences for its actors. Whereas the specific modes and forms of artistic work and organizing do not appear to be deeply affected by the 'CI programme', the specific artistic self-conceptualization actually seems to be less in opposition to the new power programme than first assumptions would suggest. The very ascetic self-concept of the actors is, hence, not unproblematic. Through their attempt to position themselves 'outside of the culturpreneurial discourse', they do not only contribute to their own marginalization; in this vein, they, moreover, seem to strengthen the 'entrepreneurial order of things' and the corresponding ideal subject positions in parts. In the final section of the present paper, this 'paradox' will be discussed in more detail.

Discussion and concluding remarks

> We are autonomous but not free. The thoughts are free, but one is often subjected to the necessities. (actor)

From a governmental point of view, the *self-image* of the shadowed artists produces certain *unintended effects*: as discussed, the mythic image of the 'poor artist', existing

since the late eighteenth century, and therefore much older than 'culturpreneurial orders and truth' (Kunze 2007, 233), is largely acknowledged among artists and integrated into their artistic self-understanding, relations and respective modes of self-rationalization (also Abbing 2002, 142). The belief that one consciously chooses uncertain and underpaid working conditons – because they offer autonomy, variation and self-determination – appears to be widely spread. Artistic ideals such as freedom, commitment, discipline and self-actualization make artists, thus, to some extent exploitable. It is their 'calling' and conviction to 'have no alternative' that leads to the acceptance and even co-production of their precarious modes of existence (Lorey 2007, 128–31).

The empirical insights, furthermore, show that the artists subject to the *neoliberal governmentality* in some ways, whereas they simultaneously resist many norms and ideals that are promoted trough the *power programme of CI*.[9] The affirmation of precarious artistic working and living situations does, now, not necessarily imply that the artists subscribe to the rationalities of the CI-discourse. In other words, while the artists seem to attach marginal importance to their individual economic living circumstances, they are keen that their work, the practice of art, is not influenced by economic and entrepreneurial orders. The question to what extent the artists subject to the new hegemony is, thus, difficult to answer. The ascetic self-conceptualization of many artists and the strong attempt to govern oneself could be seen as both – as ignorance of or resistance to the new governmental regime and as acceptance of discursively produced subject positions.

Altogether, their 'calling' makes the artists governable *and* ungovernable at the same time: ungovernable insofar as the study indicates that the art field can by no means be reduced to economic logics and functions, and, thus, be fully governed by them. Even if artistic practices and cultural materials are turned into commodities through the 'culturpreneurial discourse' (Böhm and Land 2009, 91), art and artistic events do not primarily gain their worth from their exchange value; rather it is constituted in and through their *use* value and, thus, their immaterial and aesthetic 'tenor'. Mainly due to their calling, artists, their practice and 'creativity' are never completely predictable (Virno 2005, 77); rather they will always produce a 'dangerous supplement' (Derrida 1983, 257), something that flees the governmental programme, something that is not fully controllable (Vandenberghe 2008, 878), and that transgresses and recreates established orders, truth and dominant norms. So the 'enterprising up' of the art field and its actors cannot erase the critical and subversive potentials, the creative forces and the ethical-aesthetic dimensions of the arts (Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009, 369–73).

However, the empirical investigation shows both that one cannot completely escape power programmes and their subjectifying and separating effects, and that there are always 'escape lines' that allow the undermining of dominant codes, governmental strategies and programmes (Donzelot and Gordon 2008, 60; Foucault 1982). As regards the artists shadowed within the present study, one can record that, e.g. their attempt to integrate the 'practice of critique' and, thus, the questioning of 'norms under which we are asked to act' (Butler 2005, 24) in their artistic work and performance, is rather effective. That the artists are, on the contrary, less effective in achieving their personal aim of 'cultivating themselves' through self-governance (Foucault 1982), seems to be, not least, linked to their effort to position themselves '*outside*' of the economy and its orders. As the actors want to be 'as independent as possible', they reject any external influence or prescription regarding the conception and practice of art. Simultaneously, they hardly seem to reflect on the broader effects of their self-positioning and

self-understanding; so they hardly question the 'commitments and obligations as well as the kinds of truths' (Hamann 2009, 58) about their selves they 'rely upon and reinforce in the process of doing so' (Foucault 1992; Hamann 2009, 58). Now, considering the de-limiting and individualizing 'nature' of the neoliberal 'regime of truth', it seems that a – powerful – critical (and) political response to it actually has to come 'from *within*' and, thus – immediately, locally and collectively – address it on its own terrain – that of the production of subjectivity, freedom and choice (Read 2009, 36).

Precariously, however, through their ascetic, non-entrepreneurial and non-calculating self-understanding and ethos the actors shadowed do not only renew their own marginalization, but they also strengthen the discursive construction of artists as general ideals of a world of work, organized according to neoliberal logics. This construction or co-production is facilitated through the fact that, on closer examination, several artistic (subject) ideals such as, e.g. self-responsibility, curiosity and passion – even if emerging from specific professional-artistic discourses – are not simply opposed to neoliberal moral codes. By contrast, in a certain way, they fit rather well into the neoliberal power programme that aims to construct individuals as self-organized, flexible and creative entrepreneurs. As a trend, through their specific modes of (self)conduct the artists, thus, unintentionally sustain the promotion of certain 'entrepreneurialized' artistic 'values' within flexible 'cultural capitalism' (Rifkin 2001) – even if they are actually at pains to resist the 'neoliberal regime of truth' and its power structures. However, as mentioned above, the recent form of capitalism seems to be a 'viral type'. Due to its adaptiveness and mutability, it seems to be able to absorb critique and fold it according to its own governmental targets (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005). Among other things, this 'capability' leads to the (re)definition of *artists* as *role models of the 'neoliberal regime of choice'* (Loacker 2010).

Since in the 'creative knowledge economy' innovation, self-management, improvisation and cooperation are the slogans of the day (Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009, 363), the art profession seems to develop as an appealing new standard of the autonomous worker that is not tied to any routines or stable structures but rather to 'self-actualization interests' (Menger 2006, 53). Within 'cultural capitalism', the art field and its actors appear, thus, to be constituted as 'precursors' in different regards.

One central precursor role, currently attributed to the art(ist)s, seems to relate to the specific *contents of artistic production:* Artistic labour, based on subjectivity, affect and communication, is understood as 'productive labour' (Böhm and Land 2009, 88; Lazzarato 1998). Through the delivery of various 'creative impulses' artistic workers are, so, to mobilize the emerging cadre of knowledge workers (Goehler 2006). This, again, seems to be of high relevance as the whole production process has shifted – from the production of goods to the production of signs (Hesmondhalgh 2007; Vandenberghe 2008, 891).

Another precursor role of the arts, however, seems to relate to the particular organizing forms of artistic work(ers): Within the network society not solely creativity, but also 'creative forms of organizing' become key features of a 'successful' performance (Lotter 2007). Short-term, market-focused and self-managed modes of work are judged as such forms. Artists seem to appreciate to act self-responsibly within team-based forms of work (Haunschild 2003; Virno 2005). The art profession is subsequently also defined as a role model in testing hyper-flexible, dynamic and network-orientated forms of work (Haak 2008; Menger 2006).

A third significant precursor role, finally, refers to the specific artistic (work) ethos: high commitment, 'playfulness' and self-discipline, as well as team spirit, tolerance and

selflessness are generally seen as the 'typical' ideals of the artistic ethos (Florida 2002; Friebe and Lobo 2006). Moreover, artists seem to be so passionate about their work that they are also motivated in the absence of paid compensation (Mörsch 2003). Besides, they seem to appreciate the blurring of the distinction between work and pleasure; creativity, so, becomes itself a lifestyle (Koppetsch 2006).

However, these exemplarily mentioned role model functions indicate, among other things, that the discursive image of the 'artistic self', promoted through the neoliberal 'regime of truth' (and as shown, partly supported by the actors themselves), broadens the image of the 'homo economicus' – as 'entrepreneurial self' – in some respects (Böhm and Land 2009). So from a governmental perspective the paper at hand, which was interested in the question of how the 'culturpreneurial' transformation of the arts re-creates artistic practices, modes of conduct and subject positions, finally argues that, these days, the artistic self becomes a more attractive subject ideal than the 'entrepreneurial self'. To recapitulate: the artist is currently constructed as an 'expert' of knowledge-intensive and innovative work, as an expert of self-organized and project-focused modes of organizing and as an expert of 'good ethics' – in terms of selflessness, passion and enthusiasm. Differently put, in the 'knowledge society' it seems to be primarily the 'artist' that is discursively defined as social model of a deregulated, liberated and individualized world of work (Mörsch 2003, 63; Schröder and Blair 1999, 8). Moreover, the present study tried to illustrate that, with the establishment of the creative 'knowledge economy', the economization of several life aspects and the limitless marketization of the working subject are by no means in opposition to the aesthetization, affectualization and moralization of work and life (Koppetsch 2006). In reference to the 'new model of the artist', the 'neoliberal regime of truth', primarily interested in the creation of mobilized workforces and productive lives, appears to be enabled to align autonomy and control, commitment and self-discipline, self-fulfilment and exploitation (Lazzarato 2007). In terms of 'play, freedom and joy' it seems to be quite easy to transform individuals into self-responsible and highly committed subjects of precarious – but 'creative' and 'self-chosen' – working and living circumstances (McRobbie 2009). The discursive constitution of human beings as artists seems, thus, to offer even more extensive possibilities to modulate, regulate and make individuals and their lives governable – than just appealing them as strategic entrepreneurs.

Acknowledgements

The author extends special thanks to the two anonymous reviewers and the editor for their very valuable comments and feedback. The empirical research of this article was funded by a grant from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) as 'Re-creating organization', Project number P19026-G11.

Notes

1. 'Regime' is in the current context used in order to delineate a more or less coherent rationality assemblage that encompasses, includes and excludes various power/knowledge discourses, practices and technologies (Foucault 1991). The phrase 'regime of truth' (Foucault 1994) more explicitly emphasizes that regimes structure and define 'what is to be known' (Foucault 1991, 75) and 'what is to be done' (Foucault 1991, 75) at a very particular historical and cultural time.
2. The term was introduced by Deleuze (1995), who argued that 'disciplinary societies' (Foucault 1994) have been modulated after 1950 and been transformed into what he calls post-disciplinary 'societies of control' (also Foucault 2008; Weiskopf and Loacker 2006).

3. Current flexible capitalism demonstrated its 'creativity', e.g. through the modes in which it absorbed criticism that was passed on the 'disciplinary regime' (of work organization). Both the left and the right criticized the disciplinary power programme for its rigidity, density of regulation, restrictions, etc. As is known, within the 'post-disciplinary regime' these objections were taken up and transformed into new norms and imperatives that are, again, in line with the governmental rationalities and intents of flexible capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005, 142–5).
4. As analytical category, the term 'cultural industries' was originally brought in by Adorno and Horkheimer (1977).
5. See Blair's speech in London's Tate Modern museum in March 2007: www.number10.gov.uk/Page11166.
6. The following European (however, mainly Austrian) CI policy documents were analysed for the study at hand: Erster Österreichischer Kreativwirtschaftsbericht (KMU) (2003); Goehler (2006); Greenbook Culture and Creativity from the London Department for CMS (2001); Kulturwirtschaftsbericht des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2001); Mapping Document of the London Department for CMS (1998); Schlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission 'Kultur in Deutschland' (EKKD) (2007) and Bericht zum ökonomischen Potential der Creative Industries in Wien (KMW) (2004). This review was, furthermore, supplemented by an analysis of management and governmentality studies texts that explicitly relate to the cultural field, its functions and logics (e.g. Caves 2000; Florida 2002; Gray 2002; Lange et al. 2009; Leadbeater 2007; Lotter 2007; O'Connor 2000; more critically e.g. Böhm and Land 2009; Boltanski and Chiapello 2005; Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009; Hesmondhalgh 2007; McRobbie 2009; Menger 2006; Mörsch 2003).
7. The 'creative-industries discourse' that follows the key-note of exploitable individual creativity has to be seen as an 'inter-discourse' that is constituted, co-and re-produced through various agencies of government – from academics, to consultants, media agencies, political institutions, etc. (also Boon, Jones, and Curnow 2009).
8. The independent theatre, formally organized as a non-profit association receives a modicum of subsidies from the town, the state, as well as from some private sponsors. Still, for its viability, it cannot hand over responsibility to its promoters. Moreover, all but the theatre's management and the technicians are self-employed actors who usually work on project-based arrangements.
9. As analysed, the CI discourse produces a certain order of knowledge and truth in which the artistic subject is produced and positioned as autonomous 'culturpreneur' that strategically makes use of this 'cultural, symbolic and social capital'. The culturpreneurial role model, thus, discursively re-defines the ideal self-concept, skills and performance, demanded from artists; by this means, it also affects the way artists have to see themselves as 'professionals'. The fact that the model of the 'culturpreneur' produces such subjectifying effects does, again, not imply that the artists subject to the model's particular normative invocations (Foucault 1982, 221, 1994).

References

Abbing, H. 2002. *Why are artists poor?* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Adorno, T., and M. Horkheimer. 1977. *Dialektik der Aufklärung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Alanen, A. 2007. What's wrong with the concept of creative industries? *Framework. The Finnish Art Review 6*. http://www.framework.fi/6_2007/locating/artikkelit/alanen.html (accessed December 27, 2009).

Alvesson, M., and K. Sköldberg. 2000. *Reflexive methodology. New vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Barratt, E. 2008. The later Foucault in organization and management studies. *Human Relations* 61, no. 4: 515–37.

Bauman, Z. 2001. *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Blair, T. 2007. The value of art. Cultural speech at Tate Modern. http://number10.gov.uk/Page11166 (accessed December 27, 2009).

Böhm, S., and C. Land. 2009. No measure for culture? Value in the new economy. *Capital & Class* 33, no. 1: 75–98.

Boltanski, L., and E. Chiapello. 2005. *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.
Boon, B., D. Jones, and B. Curnow. 2009. Out of the blue: The dark side of creative enterprise. *Culture and Organization* 15, no. 3: 361–77.
Butler, J. 2005. *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
Castells, M. 2001. *The rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Caves, R.E. 2000. *Creative industries: Contracts between arts and business*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Czarniawska, B. 1998. *A narrative approach to organization studies*. London: Sage.
Dalton, P. 2001. *The gendering of art education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Davies, A., and S. Ford. 1998. Art capital. *Art Monthly* 1, no. 213: 12–20.
Deleuze, G. 1995. *Negotiations; 1972–1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1980. *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minesota Press.
Derrida, J.J. 1983. *Grammatologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
Donzelot, J., and C. Gordon. 2008. Governing liberal societies – the Foucault effect in the English-speaking world. Interview. *Foucault Studies* 5, no. 1: 48–62.
Eichmann, H., J. Flecker, and S. Reidl. 2007. *'Es ist ja ein freies Gewerbe . . .' Arbeiten in der Wiener Kreativwirtschaft.* WWTF-Forschungsprojekt Forba. Endbericht. Wien. http://www.forba.at/kreativbranchen-wien/bericht7.html (accessed July 16, 2010).
Enquete-Kommission 'Kultur in Deutschland' (EKKD). 2007. *Schlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission 'Kultur in Deutschland'*. Berlin: Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 16/7000.
Europäische Kommission. 1998. *Kultur, Kulturwirtschaft und Beschäftigung. Arbeitsdokument der Kommissionsdienstellen*. Brüssel: Europäische Kommission.
Florida, R. 2002. *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
Foucault, M. 1982. Afterword by Michel Foucault: The subject and power. In *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, ed. H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, 208–26. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Foucault, M. 1991. Governmentality. In *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality*, ed. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, 53–82. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Foucault, M. 1992. *Was Ist Kritik?* Berlin: Merve.
Foucault, M. 1994. *Überwachen und Strafen. Die Geburt des Gefängnisses*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
Foucault, M. 2007. *Security, territory, population. Lectures at the collège de France 1977–1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Foucault, M. 2008. *The birth of biopolitics. Lectures at the college de France 1978–1979*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
Friebe, H., and S. Lobo. 2006. *Wir nennen es Arbeit. Die digitale Bohème oder intelligentes Leben jenseits der Festanstellung*. München: Heyne.
du Gay, P. 1996. *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.
Goehler, A. 2006. *Verflüssigungen. Wege und Umwege vom Sozialstaat zur Kulturgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
Gray, C. 2002. Local government and the arts. *Local Government Studies* 28, no. 19: 77–90.
Haak, C. 2008. *Wirtschaftliche und Soziale Risiken auf den Arbeitsmärkten von Künstlern*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
Hamann, T.H. 2009. Neoliberalism, governmentality, and ethics. *Foucault Studies* 6, no. 1: 37–59.
Haunschild, A. 2003. Managing employment relationships in flexible labour markets: The case of German repertory theatres. *Human Relations* 56, no. 5: 899–929.
Hesmondhalgh, D. 2007. *The cultural industries*. London: Sage.
Kannonier-Finster, W., and M. Ziegler, eds. 1998. *Exemplarische Erkenntnis. Zehn Beiträge zur interpretativen Erforschung sozialer Wirklichkeit*. Innsbruck Wien: Studien-Verlag.
KMU Forschung Austria (KMU), Institut für Kulturmanagement und Kulturwissenschaft der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien. 2003. *Erster Österreichischer Kulturwirtschaftsbericht*. Erstellt im Auftrag vom Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit, Staatssekretariat für Kunst und Medien und der Wirtschaftskammer Österreich. Wien. http://www.creativwirtschaft.at/document/kwb_2003.pdf (accessed July 16, 2010).

Koppetsch, C. 2006. *Das Ethos der Kreativen*. Konstanz: UVK.
Kulturdokumentation, Mediacult, Wifo (KMW). 2004. *Untersuchung des ökonomischen Potentials der 'Creative Industries' in Wien.* Erstellt im Auftrag der Stadt Wien, Wirtschaftskammer Wien und des Filmfonds Wien. Wien. http://www.creativeindustries.at/pdf/Endbericht.pdf (accessed July 16, 2010).
Kunze, H.R. 2007. Künstlerbild und Kreativität Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts. In *Schlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission 'Kultur in Deutschland'*, ed. 16 Deutscher Bundestag, 229–37. Berlin: 16 Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 16/7000.
Lamnek, S. 1995. *Qualitative Sozialforschung*. Weinheim: Beltz.
Lange, B. 2007. *Die Räume der Kreativszene. Culturepreneurs und ihre Orte in Berlin*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Lange, B., A. Kalandides, B. Stöber, and I. Wellmann, eds. 2009. *Governance der Kreativwirtschaft. Diagnosen und Handlungsoptionen*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Lazzarato, M. 1998. Verwertung und Kommunikation. In *Umherschweifende Produzenten. Immaterielle Arbeit und Subversion*, ed. A. Negri, M. Lazzarato and P. Virno, 53–66. Berlin: ID Verlag.
Lazzarato, M. 2007. Die Missgeschicke der 'Künstlerkritik' und der kulturellen Beschäftigung. In *Kritik der Kreativität*, ed. G. Raunig and U. Wuggenig, 190–206. Wien: Turia+Kant.
Leadbeater, C. 2007. Anleitung zum Selbermachen. Wie werden wir künftig unser Leben bestreiten? Individuell. Und kooperativ. *brand eins* 6, no. 5: 65–8.
Loacker, B. 2010. *kreativ prekär: künstlerische Arbeit und Subjektivität im Postfordismus*. Bielefeld: transcript.
London Department for Culture, Media and Sport (CMS). 1998. *Mapping document 'creative industries'*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
London Department for Culture, Media and Sport (CMS). 2001. *Greenbook 'culture and creativity: The next ten years'*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
Lorey, I. 2007. Vom immanenten Widerspruch zur hegemonialen Funktion. Biopolitische Gouvernementalität und Selbstprekarisierung von KulturproduzentInnen. In *Kritik der Kreativität*, ed. G. Raunig and U. Wuggenig, 121–36. Wien: Turia+Kant.
Lotter, W. 2007. Die Gestörten. *brand eins* 6, no. 5: 52–62.
Lüders, C. 2003. Beobachten im Feld und Ethnographie. In *Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch*, ed. U. Flick, E. Von Kardoff and I. Steinke, 384–401. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
Mayerhofer, E., and M. Mokre. 2007. Geniekünstler und Kulturarbeiterinnen – von der Freiheit der Kunst zur Wertschöpfung durch Kreativität. *SWS Rundschau* 3, no. 47: 292–311.
McRobbie, A. 2009. Reflections on precarious work in the cultural sector. In *Governance der Kreativwirtschaft. Diagnosen und Handlungsoptionen*, ed. B. Lange, A. Kalandides, B. Stöber and I. Wellmann, 123–37. Bielefeld: transcript.
Menger, P.M. 2006. *Kunst und Brot. Die Metamorphosen des Arbeitnehmers*. Konstanz: UVK.
Ministerium für Wirtschaft und Mittelstand, Technologie und Verkehr des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. 2001. *Kulturwirtschaftsbericht des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Düsseldorf: Ministerium für Wirtschaft und Mittelstand, Technologie und Verkehr des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen.
Mörsch, C. 2003. Socially engaged economies: Leben von und mit künstlerischen Beteiligungsprojekten und Kunstvermittlung in England. *Kurswechsel* 4, no. 4: 62–74.
O'Connor, J. 2000. The definition of the cultural industries. *The European Journal of Arts Education* 2, no. 3: 15–27.
Read, J. 2009. A genealogy of homo-economicus: Neoliberalism and the production of subjectivity. *Foucault Studies* 6, no. 1: 25–36.
Rifkin, J. 2001. *The age of access*. New York: Tarcher.
Rose, N., and P. Miller. 1992. Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 2: 173–205.
Schröder, G., and T. Blair. 1999. Das Schröder-Blair-Papier. *'Der Weg nach vorne für Europas Sozialdemokraten'*. London. http://www.robert-zion.de/downloads/Schroeder_Blair.pdf (accessed December 27, 2009).
Thanem, T. 2009. 'There's no limit to how much you can consume': The new public health and the struggle to manage healthy bodies. *Culture and Organization* 15, no. 1: 59–74.
Townley, B., N. Beech, and A. Mckinlay. 2009. Managing in the creative industries: Managing the motley crew. *Human Relations* 62, no. 7: 939–62.

Vandenberghe, F. 2008. Deleuzian capitalism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 34, no. 8: 877–903.
Virno, P. 2005. *Grammatik der Mulitude*. Wien: Turia+Kant.
Weiskopf, R., and B. Loacker. 2006. 'A snake's coils are even more intricate than a mole's burrow'. Individualization and subjectivation in post-discplinary regimes of work. *Management Revue* 17, no. 4: 395–419.
Zembylas, T., and M. Mokre. 2003. Sein oder Nichtsein. Vielfalts- und Partizipationsförderung als Leitziele einer zukünftigen Kulturpolitik. *Kurswechsel* 4, no. 4: 47–61.